1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
3	
4	AJZN, INC. f/k/a AERIELLE,) Civil Action INC.,
5	Plaintiff,)
6	v. ,
7	DONALD YU, et al.,
8	Defendants.) No. 13-149-GMS
9	
10	Wilmington, Delaware
11	Friday, February 6, 2015 11:00 a.m.
12	Telephone Conference
13	
14	BEFORE: HONORABLE GREGORY M. SLEET, U.S.D.C.J.
15	APPEARANCES:
16	PILAR G. KRAMAN, ESQ. Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP
17	-and- LAWRENCE J. HILTON, ESQ., and
18	KATHLEEN A. DONAHUE, ESQ. O'Neil LLP
19	(Irvine, CA)
20	Counsel for Plaintiff
21	FRANCIS G.X. PILEGGI, ESQ., and AIMEE M. CZACHOROWSKI, ESQ.
22	Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC -and-
23	BENJAMIN G. STEWART, ESQ. Keating Muething & Klekamp PLL
24	(Cincinnati, OH)
25	Counsel for Defendants

:59:49

:59:49	1	THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. Who is
:59:52	2	appearing today for the plaintiff, please?
:59:55	3	MS. KRAMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. This is
:59:57	4	Pilar Kraman at Young Conaway. With me on the line is
:00:00	5	Lawrence Hilton and Kathleen Donahue of O'Neil LLP.
:00:03	6	THE COURT: Good morning.
:00:06	7	For the various defendants? Do we have more
:00:08	8	than one counsel? For instance, Donald Hu?
:00:11	9	MR. PILEGGI: Good morning, Your Honor. This is
:00:15	10	Francis Pileggi from Eckert Seamans. We represent all of
:00:19	11	the defendants. My co-counsel, Aimee Czachorowski, is on
:00:24	12	the phone, and my co-counsel Ben Stewart is also on the
:00:27	13	phone as well.
:00:28	14	THE COURT: Good morning to you all. I won't
:00:30	15	keep you long. I will fill in the blanks that you left in
:00:33	16	your proposed scheduling order which dates I find
:00:36	17	acceptable.
:00:36	18	And I am going to ask that plaintiff, or whoever
:00:40	19	prepared this, get it filed by the 13th of the month, if you
:00:44	20	would.
:00:47	21	Here are your blanks. We are going to have a
:00:51	22	pretrial conference beginning at 10:00 a.m. over here at the
:00:55	23	courthouse on May 2, 2016.
:01:01	24	Pretrial order will be due close of business,
:01:04	25	6:00 p.m., April 18, 2016.

Trial will commence 5/23/2016.	:01:10 1	:01:1
Now, what I wanted to talk to	:01:16 2	:01:1
form of trial. There seems to be a differ	:01:20 3	:01:2
between the parties as to whether there is	:01:22 4	:01:2
a jury. Has anybody demanded a jury in th	:01:26 5	:01:2
MR. HILTON: Your Honor, Larry	:01:34 6	:01:3
plaintiff.	:01:35 7	:01:3
Yes, we did have a jury demand	:01:36	:01:3
THE COURT: And, therefore, yo	:01:40 9	:01:4
this should be a jury.	:01:43 10	:01:4
Is there a different view on t	:01:44 11	:01:4
MR. STEWART: Your Honor, yes.	:01:48 12	:01:4
Stewart for the defendants.	:01:50 13	:01:5
Just as a way of very brief ba	:01:52 14	:01:5
originally, this case was filed in Californ	:01:54 15	:01:5
transferred to your Court pursuant to a for	:01:58 16	:01:5
clause. Our position is that in that agree	:02:01 17	:02:0
fact is, in that agreement, there is also	:02:04 18	:02:0
trial. And our position is that that claus	:02:08 19	:02:0
So we would oppose the request for a jury	:02:14 20	:02:1
THE COURT: Why don't you want	:02:17 21	:02:1
other than the clause?	:02:21 22	:02:2
MR. STEWART: I would say my c	:02:26 23	:02:2
is the cost, and it is what they bargained	:02:30 24	:02:3
it's a more efficient means of resolving the	:02:35 25	:02:3

you about is the ence of view an entitlement to is case?

Hilton for the

in our complaint. u believe that

he other side? This is Ben

ckground, nia, and was rum selection ement -- well, the a waiver of a jury se is enforceable. trial.

a jury trial,

lient's position for. They think he dispute.

:02:45	1
:02:48	2
:02:51	3
:02:53	4
:03:01	5
:03:06	6
:03:10	7
:03:15	8
:03:17	9
:03:19	10
:03:25	11
:03:30	12
:03:32	13
:03:35	14
:03:40	15
:03:43	16
:03:48	17
:03:52	18
:03:55	19
:03:57	20
:03:59	21
:04:02	22
:04:06	23
:04:09	24
:04:13	25

We are happy to brief that at whatever time is most convenient for Your Honor, whether that be --

THE COURT: I doubt I am going to permit briefing on this, counsel. With all due respect -- the other side, why isn't he right, if there is a clause in the relevant agreement where there has been a waiver, why doesn't that apply here?

MR. HILTON: Your Honor, we don't believe that the claims that survived the Court's ruling on the motion to dismiss were included within the jury trial waiver, number one. And number two, we question whether the jury trial waiver was valid anyway.

But primarily, the claims that are going forward are claims that arose after the agreement was entered into.

We don't believe that they are even covered. We did have a contract claim based on the contract with the jury waiver.

And the Court granted the motion to dismiss on that. But the claims that we have that have survived we don't believe are within the scope of the jury waiver.

THE COURT: That's interesting.

What is the other side, what is your thought on that? That seems to me to be pretty black and white. Yes?

MR. STEWART: I mean, our position would be that the same claims that were in the forum selection clause and

were transferred to your Court were related enough that they were subject to the waiver as well.

THE COURT: That's sort of just a rather conclusory statement. Why do you say that?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

:04:19

:04:23

:04:24

:04:27

:04:32

:04:36

:04:40

:04:44

:04:50

:04:53

:04:58

:05:02

:05:07

:05:13

:05:16

:05:22

:05:23

:05:28

:05:33

:05:36

:05:42

:05:43

:05:45

:05:49

:05:54

Let me ask this, with apologies. I am sure you weren't prepared to exactly dig this deep into this issue.

But on the plaintiff's side, what claims are there that you say that have survived, were not contemplated by the clause in question?

MR. HILTON: Yes, Your Honor. The claims that are remaining in the case are, number one, a breach of fiduciary duty claim against Donald Hu. Donald Hu, number one, is not a signatory to the agreement with the jury waiver. Number two, the claim for breach of fiduciary duty is based on Donald Hu's position as the CEO of the plaintiff.

So we don't think that the plaintiff's waiver of a jury trial for claims against the Great American Life

Insurance Company would even cover a claim that it has against its own CEO for breach of fiduciary duty. That is number one.

Number two, we have a claim that survives under this what we have called an earnout agreement. The earnout agreement didn't even exist until a year or more after the transaction with the jury waiver.

1 :05:57 2 :06:01 3 :06:07 4 :06:11 5 :06:12 6 :06:15 7 :06:20 8 :06:24 9 :06:28 :06:31 10 11 :06:37 12 :06:41 13 :06:46 14 :06:52 15 :06:57 16 :07:04 17 :07:06 18 :07:10 19 :07:13 20 :07:16 21 :07:22 :07:27 22 23 :07:30 24 :07:32 25 :07:39

This was a claim -- it's a right that arose long after the jury waiver, and under a completely separate agreement that does not have a jury waiver.

That is No. 2.

And the other claims that we have are basically fraudulent transfer and successor-in-interest claims for transfer of this intellectual property that occurred years after the agreement was signed to have the jury waiver.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to conditionally schedule this as a jury trial, subject to the possibility of later letter-style briefing. I won't permit full-blown briefing on this issue. And if it is still a live issue, you will report that in the proposed final pretrial order, obviously, and I will likely, if I don't feel able to resolve it simply on review of relevant case law, let you do some letter briefing on the point.

But that's the way I will leave things stand at this point. Okay?

(Counsel respond "Thank you.")

THE COURT: And I see you included a sentence referring this matter to a Magistrate Judge. Let me just take a look at this one paragraph, hold on, that I have bracketed. Hold on, please, just a second.

(Pause.)

Let me ask this question. I am going to take us

:07:43	1	off the record for a moment.
:14:31	2	(Discussion off the record.)
:14:32	3	THE COURT: We were just off the record talking
:14:33	4	about the prospects for settlement. The Court has offered
:14:38	5	to lend an assist if the parties believe it would be helpful
:14:43	6	relative to third-party agreements to institute an order or
:14:47	7	execute an order directing defendant to turn over the
:14:52	8	information that plaintiff and defendant agree would be
:14:55	9	critical to the amicable resolution of the problem.
:14:59	10	It just seems kind of obvious that that should
:15:02	11	be done. I look forward to that happening ASAP, counsel.
:15:09	12	Okay?
:15:13	13	(Counsel respond "Thank you.")
:15:15	14	THE COURT: Anything else?
:15:20	15	MR. HILTON: Not from the plaintiff's side, Your
:15:23	16	Honor.
:15:23	17	MR. STEWART: Nothing from the defendants, Your
:15:23	18	Honor.
:15:25	19	THE COURT: Have a good weekend, counsel.
:15:27	20	(Conference concluded at 11:15 a.m.)
:15:27	21	
:15:27	22	Reporter: Kevin Maurer
	23	
	24	
	25	